is concerned with the relief of a region rather than with its geologic history. At the same time, the historical treatment is entirely adequate to satisfy the needs of an ecologist, and abundant references to the literature are given for the benefit of any who wish more detailed information. To illustrate the mode of treatment, the section devoted to the Adirondack Mountains may be cited. The subdivisions are as follows: geologic structure, topography and drainage, glacial effects, climate and forests.

The notes upon the forests which are appended to most of the sections are the least satisfactory portions of the work, being so brief and general as to be almost useless, and in one case at least inaccurate. The conifer forest of the southern Appalachian summits is referred to in three places. On p. 122 it is correctly described as "spruce and balsam." On p. 125 we read of the "spruce and hemlock forests on the summits of the Pisgah and other ranges in western North Carolina, where boreal conditions exist." The hemlock in these mountains is found principally in deep ravines in the lower hardwood forest belt, and rarely attains to the lower margin of the spruce-balsam forest. On p. 614 occurs the statement that "on the higher summits of the Great Smoky, Pisgah, and Balsam Mountains are a few thousand acres of black spruce," with no mention of the balsam, which is the more important of the two. On the same page, the author places the hemlock where it rightly belongs, in "shaded ravines and on the better watered northern or northwestern slopes between 3000 and 5000 feet."

The book is adequately illustrated and has valuable physiographic and geologic maps. Its great weight is to be regretted, in a volume which one would wish to carry upon his travels.—WILLIAM S. COOPER.

A Yosemite flora

Professor and Mrs. H. M. HALL of the University of California are pioneers in the production of a local flora or handbook of one of our great natural playgrounds. Scores and scores of other local floras have been produced, but these have been as a rule mere check lists, and in all cases were intended to meet a local need. In this *Flora of the Yosemite*[2] we have a handbook that will find its largest use among strangers to the region. It is hardly necessary to call attention to the small size of this National Park as compared with the size of the great state of California, nor to the great size of the Park *botanically* considered. Within its 1024 square miles there are probably more kinds of soil and climate than can be found in any equal area in the world. This varied topography and climate have supplied the 955 species included in the flora. The grasses, sedges, and rushes are not included, but the authors conservatively estimate that these would swell the number to 1200, a number probably as great as that of an entire state in the prairie region.

[2] HALL, HARVEY MONROE and CARLOTTA CASE, A Yosemite flora. San Francisco: Paul Elder & Co. $2.16.

The book possesses practically every feature that will contribute to its usefulness: an introduction to the Park itself; a chapter on the organography of the plant for those who have not had a course in botany; simple but complete keys; plain concise descriptions with a minimum of technical terms; interesting notes on habitat, habit, distribution, etc; 11 beautiful halftone plates in brown, and 174 instructive figures; a glossary and a complete index. This little manual of nearly 300 pages is significant in many ways. It indicates an increasing interest in technically correct science simply and clearly expressed. It emphasizes the fact that systematic botany should be developed for the *use* of the people, not to *impress* them with the futility of trying to fathom the mysteries of recent nomenclatural practices. It shows that the breeze is beginning to blow steadily from the ocean, littered with the wreckage of families, genera, and species, to the solid shores on which an *Astragalus* is an *Astragalus* and not a *Tium;* a *gentian* is a *gentian* and not an *Anthopogon;* and a *pine* is a *pine* and not an *apine.*

When a thing is so well done it seems almost ungenerous to mention matters which represent merely differences of opinion, but would it not have been well to have included the grasses, sedges, and rushes for the sake of completeness? Botanists would have valued this feature even if the descriptions had been very much curtailed. Attention may also be called to the seeming ultra-conservatism of the authors in the matters of the adoption of recent names for old, well known species. To a beginner, one technical name is as good as another, and no useful purpose is served by retaining a name that properly belongs in another range, even though that name has long been used in ours.

The publishers have done their work well. The binding is limp leather, the paper excellent in quality, and the pages are trimmed close, so that the little volume feels good in the hand and will no doubt find its way into the pockets of many of the visitors to the Yosemite Park.—AVEN NELSON.

NOTES FOR STUDENTS

Current taxonomic literature.—L. R. ABRAMS (Muhlenbergia **8**:26–44. 1912) gives a synoptical revision of the genus *Monardella*, as represented in southern California, and adds 4 new species, and 3 varieties.—O. AMES (Torreya **12**:11–13. 1912) has published a new *Habenaria* (*H. Brittonae*) from Cuba.—J. C. ARTHUR (Mycologia **4**:49–65. 1912) records the results of continued studies on the "Cultures of Uredineae in 1911."—O. BECCARI (Webbia **3**:131–165. 1910) under the title "Palmae australasiche nuove o poco note" has published several new species of palms and proposes a new genus (*Pritchardiopsis*) of this family from New Caledonia.—A. BRAND (Rep. Sp. Nov. **10**:280, 281. 1912) characterizes a new genus (*Namation*) of the Scrophulariaceae based on the Mexican plant *Nama glandulosum* Peter. The same author (*ibid.* 281) proposes the name *Andropus carnosus* for the plant hitherto doubt-